

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on November 22, 2005 and the Advisory Action mailed March 1, 2006.

By this amendment claims 12-15 and 24 were amended and claims 11, 16-23, and 25-35 were canceled. No claims were added by this response. As a result, claims 1-10, 12-15 and 24 are now pending in this application. Reconsideration of this application in view of the below remarks is requested.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

A. Rejection: Claims 11 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly et al. (U.S. 5,798,567) in view of Miyazawa (U.S. 2002/0182842).

B. Response: By this response, claims 11 and 16 were canceled thereby obviating this rejection.

C. Rejection: Claims 17-20, 32-33, and 35 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly et al. (U.S. 5,798,567) and Miyazawa (U.S. 2002/0182842) as applied to claims 1-7 above, and further in view of Hatagishi (U.S. 4,869,972). The Examiner contends that Kelly et al. and Miyazawa teach substantially the entire structure and that the Hatagishi reference teaches the structure of the fuse.

D. Response: By this response, claims 17-20, 32-33, and 35 were canceled thereby obviating this rejection.

E. Rejection: Claims 21-23, 25-27, and 34 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly et al. (U.S. 5,798,567) and Miyazawa (U.S. 2002/0182842) as applied to claims 1-7 above, and further in view of Hatagaishi (U.S. 4,869,972) and Sugita et al. (U.S. 5,068,706). The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art "...to incorporate at least one non operational SC being positioned with respect to the PCB to prevent at least one discrete component from contacting the ground and power planes of the PCB as taught by Sugita et al. so that breakage of components can be prevented and electrical performance/reliability can be improved in Miyazawa, Hatagishi and Kelly et al's device." The Examiner cites the blown fuse of Fig. 6C of Sugita et al. for support.

F. Response: By this response, claims 21-23, 25-27, and 34 were canceled thereby obviating this rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 12-15 and 24 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By this amendment, Applicant has amended these claims to an allowable form.

Claims 1-10 were allowed. Applicant notes the indication of allowance of claims 1-10, 12-15 and 24 with appreciation.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney ((612) 373-6977) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SHAWN L. LLOYD ET AL.

By their Representatives,
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 373-6977

Date

3/21/06

By



Richard E. Billion
Reg. No. 32,836

Date of Deposit: March 22, 2006

This paper or fee is being filed on the date indicated above, using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.